

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Various of the claims are amended herein.

New claims 17-22 are added.

Support for the claim amendments and new claims is found, for example, in FIG. 1 and the disclosure on page 7, middle of the page, through page 11, second paragraph, of the specification.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-22 are currently pending.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5, 8-11 AND 14 UNDER 35 USC 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY OKAMURA

The present invention as recited, for example, in claim 1, relates to a noise light elimination method comprising: (a) amplifying a signal light so that a power of signal light components in the amplified signal light exceeds a threshold value, and a power of noise light components in the amplified signal light is smaller than the threshold value; (b) applying the amplified signal light to a stimulated Brillouin scattering generating medium that generates a return light due to stimulated Brillouin scattering when a light having a power exceeding the threshold value is applied; and (c) extracting the return light generated by the stimulated Brillouin scattering generating medium as the amplified signal light, to thereby eliminate the noise light components in the amplified signal light.

Please note that claim 1 is amended to clarify the above features. Support for the claim amendments is found, for example, in FIG. 1 and the disclosure on page 7, middle of the page, through page 11, second paragraph, of the specification.

In Okamura, stimulated Brillouin scattering is used to efficiently generate a "phase conjugate wave". In Okamura, the length of the optical fiber cable 2 connected to the input side of the optical waveform degradation compensating apparatus 21 is set to be approximately the same as that of the optical fiber cable 9 connected to the output side of the optical waveform degradation compensating apparatus 21. The "phase conjugate wave" of the signal light propagated in the input side optical fiber cable 2 is generated by the use of SBS, and is provided to the output side optical fiber cable 9. Therefore, in Okamura, the optical waveform degradation generated due to wavelength dispersion or an optical nonlinear characteristic during signal light propagation in each of the optical fiber cables 2 and 9 is offset at both of the input and output sides.

This operation in Okamura is significantly different than that recited, for example, in claim 1 of the present application. More specifically, it is respectfully submitted that Okamura does not disclose or suggest (a) amplifying a signal light so that a power of signal light components in the amplified signal light exceeds a threshold value, and a power of noise light components in the amplified signal light is smaller than the threshold value; (b) applying the amplified signal light to a stimulated Brillouin scattering generating medium that generates a return light due to stimulated Brillouin scattering when a light having a power exceeding the threshold value is applied; and (c) extracting the return light generated by the stimulated Brillouin scattering generating medium as the amplified signal light, to thereby eliminate the noise light components in the amplified signal light, as recited, for example, in the amended claim 1.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding various differences of various other claims over Okamura.

Please note that an IDS was filed concurrently herewith to submit a full English translation of Okamura. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner acknowledge the IDS.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 6-7 AND 12 UNDER 35 USC 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER OKAMURA IN VIEW OF SUGAYA

The above comments for distinguishing over Okamura also apply here, where appropriate.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIM 13 UNDER 35 USC 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER OKAMURA IN VIEW OF JOHNSON

The above comments for distinguishing over Okamura also apply here, where appropriate.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

V. REJECTION OF CLAIM 15 UNDER 35 USC 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER OKAMURA IN VIEW OF KAI

The above comments for distinguishing over Okamura also apply here, where appropriate.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VI. REJECTION OF CLAIM 16 UNDER 35 USC 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE
OVER OKAMURA IN VIEW OF KAI AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF UETSUKA

The above comments for distinguishing over Okamura also apply here, where appropriate.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VII. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

June 21, 2005

By:

Paul I. Kravetz
Paul I. Kravetz
Registration No. 35,230

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501